hep-ph/0204207
NIKHEF/2002-001

Exploring the QED vacuum with laser interferometers

Daniël Boer[1] and Jan-Willem van Holten[1,2]

[1] *Division of Physics and Astronomy, Vrije Universiteit, De Boelelaan 1081 NL-1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

[2] *NIKHEF, P.O. Box 41882, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

February 1, 2008

arXiv:hep-ph/0204207v1 17 Apr 2002

It is demonstrated that the nonlinear, and as yet unobserved, QED effect of slowing down light by application of a strong magnetic field may be observable with large laser interferometers like for instance LIGO or GEO600.

12.20.Fv, 07.60.Ly, 41.20.Jb, 42.25.Lc, 41.25.Bs, 95.75.Kk

The nonlinear properties of the QED vacuum in the presence of an external electromagnetic field have been studied theoretically for more than 65 years. The famous Euler-Heisenberg lagrangian [1] is a low-energy effective lagrangian describing such physics of (multiple) photon interactions. The latter interactions arise effectively due to interactions with the electron field which is integrated out. The lowest order consequences of these effective photon interactions are light-by-light scattering, two-photon splitting and the effects on photon propagation, such as birefringence and dichroism. Thus far these effects have not been observed directly yet, since they are extremely small. For example, the light-by-light scattering cross section is proportional to $\alpha^4\omega^6/m^8$, where the center of mass photon frequency ω is assumed to be very small compared to the electron mass m.

Another QED vacuum effect, the Schwinger mechanism of e^+e^- pair production in an electric field, which requires very large fields $|eE| \sim m$, has only recently been observed [2].

Here we will investigate the effect of a strong magnetic field on photon propagation, and argue that this effect may be observable by exploiting one of the large laser interferometers that are designed to try to detect gravitational waves. We start by observing that light propagating in a magnetic field no longer propagates with velocity $v = c$. Using the Euler-Heisenberg lagrangian (for instance given in SI units)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= -\frac{c^2\epsilon_0}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\alpha^2\hbar^3\epsilon_0^2}{90m^4c}\left[(F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu})^2 + \frac{7}{4}\left(F_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}\right)^2\right] \\ &= \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}\left(\boldsymbol{E}^2 - c^2\boldsymbol{B}^2\right) + \frac{2\alpha^2\hbar^3\epsilon_0^2}{45m^4c^5}\left[\left(\boldsymbol{E}^2 - c^2\boldsymbol{B}^2\right)^2 + 7c^2\left(\boldsymbol{E}\cdot\boldsymbol{B}\right)^2\right], \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

the first order correction to the velocity has been derived several times already [3–7] and reads:

$$\frac{v}{c} = 1 - a\,\frac{\alpha^2\hbar^3\epsilon_0}{45m^4c^3}\,B^2\,\sin^2\theta_B, \tag{2}$$

where θ_B is the angle between the direction of the photon propagation and the magnetic field B. These two directions span a plane, and the constant a is either 8 or 14 for the so-called $\parallel$ or $\perp$ modes of the photon polarization, that are parallel or perpendicular to that plane.

This first order correction given in Eq. (2) is sufficient in case the magnetic field is small compared to what is usually called the critical magnetic field $B_{cr} \equiv m^2c^2/e\hbar \approx 4.4 \cdot 10^9$ T. Another relevant remark is that Eq. (2) holds independently of the frequency of the photon.

Like in Ref. [4] we will express the results in terms of the quantity κ:

$$\kappa = \frac{2\alpha^2\hbar^3}{45m^4c^5} \approx 2.7 \cdot 10^{-40}\frac{\mathrm{m}^3}{\mathrm{GeV}} \tag{3}$$

or

$$c^2\epsilon_0\kappa \approx 1.3 \cdot 10^{-24}\,\mathrm{T}^{-2}. \tag{4}$$

Hence, in Heaviside-Lorentz units (in which $\epsilon_0 = 1$ and $\alpha = e^2/4\pi\hbar c$) one finds $\kappa \approx 1.3 \cdot 10^{-24}(\mathrm{Tc})^{-2}$, which is actually three orders of magnitude smaller than the value quoted in Eq. (29) of Ref. [4]. In Gaussian units (where $\epsilon_0 = 1/4\pi$ and $\alpha = e^2/\hbar c$) one arrives at $\kappa \approx 1.7 \cdot 10^{-23}$ $(\mathrm{Tc})^{-2}$. Of course, the value of the correction in Eq. (2) stays the same in both units. In terms of the critical magnetic field B_{cr}:

$$\frac{v}{c} = 1 - a\,\frac{\alpha}{180\pi}\,\frac{B^2}{B_{cr}^2}\,\sin^2\theta_B. \tag{5}$$

For $\theta_B = 90^\circ$ Eq. (2) becomes simply $v/c = 1 - ac^2\epsilon_0\kappa B^2/2$, which for $a = 14$ yields $v/c \approx 1 - 10^{-23}\,\mathrm{T}^{-2}\,B^2$.

In order to observe such effect of $v < c$ due to the presence of a strong magnetic field, one could think of trying to observe light propagation through the magnetic field of a neutron star, which can be of the order of 10^8 Tesla. In theory, this could be done with a method analogous to the measurement of the speed of light using a moon of Jupiter, but now applied to binary stars. However, this does not seem feasible in practice.

Here we want to advocate a different approach to the problem, namely not by exploiting extremely large magnetic fields, but by using a large laser interferometer, such as LIGO or GEO600 (both soon operational), in order to measure propagation of light very accurately. If one were to apply a homogeneous strong magnetic field over a stretch of one of the two legs of the interferometer (with B perpendicular to that leg), then one affects the velocity of the laser light slightly each time it traverses the magnetic field. This would result in a phase shift. In order to demonstrate the feasibility of this approach, we consider the example of LIGO [8]. We will call the length of the legs x, therefore x is taken to be 4 km (for GEO600: $x = 600$ m), and we assume the design sensitivity $\delta x/x$, which is of the order of 10^{-21}.

In the case of a gravitational wave passing the interferometer, δx is a real variation in the length of a leg (with alternating sign). In the case of an applied magnetic field δx is just the difference in distance propagated by light which travels with c over the whole distance x compared to light that travels part of x, i.e. a stretch x', with a slightly lower velocity (which has a fixed sign and is therefore a cumulative effect). One finds in that case that

$$\frac{v}{c} \approx 1 - \frac{\delta x}{x'}. \tag{6}$$

Combining this with Eq. (2) yields

$$\frac{\delta x}{x} = \frac{x'}{x}\frac{ac^2\epsilon_0\kappa}{2}B^2 \quad \overset{a=14}{\approx} \quad \frac{x'}{x} \times 10^{-23}\,\left(\frac{B}{1\,\mathrm{T}}\right)^2 \tag{7}$$

which for LIGO with for instance $x' = 4$ m (for GEO600 one arrives at the same numbers if $x' = 60$ cm), would imply a very large magnetic field $B^2 = 10^5$ T^2. Conversely, if for example, one would apply the magnetic field of 1 or 10 Tesla over $x' = 4$ m, then this would require $\delta x/x$ to be 10^{-26} or 10^{-24}, respectively. This is not expected to be reached any time soon in the case of laser interferometer gravitational wave detectors.

Another important observation is that the number of round trips that the light travels in the cavities of such an interferometer, is matched to the period of half a cycle of a gravitational wave. For instance, for a 100 Hz gravitational wave this means almost 200 round trips inside the LIGO detector in the duration of $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ seconds and the phase shift accuracy corresponding to $\delta x/x = 10^{-21}$ is then roughly $\delta\Phi \approx 200 \cdot 4\pi\delta x/\lambda \approx 2 \cdot 10^{-8}$ for $\lambda \approx 0.5\mu$m; for more details cf. Refs. [8–10]. We will use the phase shift $\delta\Phi_{\mathrm{thr}} = 2 \cdot 10^{-8}$ as the detection threshold for LIGO in our example. Note that strictly speaking the wavelength of the light traversing the magnetic field is slightly lower than the initial λ (the frequency remains unchanged), but this amounts to a higher order (in δx) effect in the calculation of $\delta\Phi$ and can be safely neglected.

Now in order to measure the effect of the QED vacuum on the propagation of light in a magnetic background field, one can simply let the light run more cycles in the interferometer. This will of course affect the noise analysis and photon loss due to scattering and absorption will become a more important issue. But if one simply takes $\delta x/x = 10^{-21}$ and multiplies with a factor n of required round trips compared to the gravitational wave detection scenario, then one gets in the above example $nB^2 = 10^5$ T^2 in order to obtain the threshold phase shift. Hence, for $B = 10$ T one finds the required number of round trips is $n = 10^3$ times the number of round trips to detect a gravitational wave. This means a build-up time of the phase shift of 5 seconds, which seems feasible.

For convenience, we include a table which shows the total number N of round trips for fixed $\delta\Phi_{\mathrm{thr}} = 2 \cdot 10^{-8}$, but for different values of the magnetic field and x' (the results are independent of the length x of the interferometer for given $\delta\Phi_{\mathrm{thr}}$). Note that the number of round trips N is directly related to the finesse of the Fabry-Perot cavity that is used.

B^2 \ x'	1 m	2 m	4 m
1 T^2	$8 \cdot 10^7$	$4 \cdot 10^7$	$2 \cdot 10^7$
10 T^2	$8 \cdot 10^6$	$4 \cdot 10^6$	$2 \cdot 10^6$
100 T^2	$8 \cdot 10^5$	$4 \cdot 10^5$	$2 \cdot 10^5$

TABLE I. Examples of the total number of round trips N for several values of the B field and x', for $\delta\Phi_{\rm thr} = 2 \cdot 10^{-8}$

We add a few more remarks. One might like to exploit the maximal phase difference that will be acquired over time, but in order to reach a phase shift $\delta\Phi = \pi$ in our example one needs to let the light run for approximately 25 years, which is not a realistic goal. Moreover, since $v_\perp \neq v_\parallel$, different polarization states would not have this phase shift at the same time.

It may be good to emphasize that for a measurement of vacuum birefringence (the fact that $n_\parallel \neq n_\perp$ and hence $v_\perp \neq v_\parallel$) one needs to polarize the light to be able to select different polarization modes. But in order to demonstrate the dispersive effect of slowing down light by application of a strong magnetic field, one can simply deal with an average of polarization states. Demonstrating the intensity variations with B^2 seems to be the best way to establish this effect.

We would like to refer to other proposals given in the literature. Refs. [11,12] propose to measure vacuum birefringence from the (essentially increasing) phase difference between the $\parallel$ and $\perp$ modes of a laser beam passing through a magnetic field (no use is made of an interferometer). This forms the basis for the PVLAS experiment [13] and requires control over the initial polarization state of the light. As explained above this is not necessary for the dispersion measurement suggested in this note, which (ideally) aims at measuring the absolute velocity decrease.

There is also a proposal [14] that tries to exploit a laser interferometer, but requires an additional laser beam crossing alternatingly the laser beams of the interferometer. The measurement is thus based on light-by-light scattering. This is quite different from the present proposal.

In conclusion, with the advent of large laser interferometers with extreme precision ($\delta x/x \sim 10^{-21}$ and better) and the feasibility of creating magnetic fields above 1 Tesla, another possibility to observe photon-photon interactions due to QED vacuum effects may be realized.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

D.B. would like to thank Jens O. Andersen for a very helpful discussion. The research of D.B. has been made possible by financial support from the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

[1] H. Euler and B. Kockel, Naturwissenschaften 23 (1935) 246;
H. Euler, Ann. d. Phys. 26 (1936) 398;
W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, Z. Phys. 98 (1936) 714;
J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. 82 (1951) 664.
[2] D.L. Burke *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 1626.
[3] S.L. Adler, Ann. Phys. 67 (1971) 599.
[4] Z. Bialynicka-Birula and I. Bialynicki-Birula, Phys. Rev. D 2 (1970) 2341.
[5] J.S. Heyl and L. Hernquist, J. Phys. A 30 (1997) 6485.
[6] W. Dittrich and H. Gies, hep-ph/9806417;
H. Gies, hep-ph/0010287.
[7] V.A. De Lorenci, R. Klippert, M. Novello, J.M. Salim, Phys. Lett. B 482 (2000) 134.
[8] A. Abramovici *et al.*, Science 256 (1992) 325.

[9] P.R. Saulson, *Fundamentals of Interferometric Gravitational Wave Detectors* (World Scientific, 1994).
[10] K.S. Thorne, gr-qc/9506086.
[11] E. Iacopini and E. Zavattini, Phys. Lett. B 85 (1979) 151.
[12] G. Cantatore *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B 265 (1991) 418.
[13] D. Bakalov, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 35 (1994) 180.
[14] M.H. Partovi, hep-ph/9308293.